

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
VALDOSTA DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	:	
	:	
v.	:	CASE NO.: 7:24-CR-00037 (WLS-ALS-1)
	:	
BRIDGET DENISE HARRIS and	:	
CRAGE BERNARD HARRIS,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	
	:	

ORDER

Defendants have filed two Motions (Docs. 63 & 64) to continue the trial in the interests of justice. They move to continue the trial to the next available trial term. B. Harris seeks a continuance stating that Counsel needs time to review discovery and discuss the case with her client. (Doc. 63 at 2). C. Harris states that he needs additional time to participate in plea negotiations. (Doc. 64 at 1). Previously, the Court denied the Government's Motion to Continue (Doc. 60), without prejudice, for failure to provide a sufficient reason to continue in accordance with the Speedy Trial Act. (Doc. 61 at 1).

Based on the Defendants' stated reasons and that the Government does not oppose the Motion, the Court finds that the ends of justice served by granting such a continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and Defendants in a speedy trial. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A)-(B). Thus, and for good cause shown, the Motions (Doc. 63 & 64) are **GRANTED**. The trial in the case is **CONTINUED** to the Valdosta Division November 2025 trial term and its conclusion, or as may be otherwise ordered by the Court.¹ Further, it is **ORDERED** that the time lost under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161, be **EXCLUDED** in accordance with 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7) because the Court has continued

¹ Defendants do not specify when in the November trial term the case should be continued to. Yet the Court continues the case until the conclusion of the November 2025 trial term because it is the Court's practice to grant continuances until the conclusion of a particular trial term to allow the scheduling of multiple trials during that term. If Defendants object to a continuance until the conclusion of the next trial term, they shall immediately advise the Court of such an objection in writing.

the trial in this case and finds that the failure to grant a continuance would likely result in a miscarriage of justice. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).

SO ORDERED, this 16th day of June 2025.

/s/ W. Louis Sands
W. LOUIS SANDS, SR. JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT